

BEFORE THE ARIZONA MEDICAL BOARD

In the Matter of

WILLIAM S. MASLAND, M.D.

Holder of License No. 6352
For the Practice of Allopathic Medicine
In the State of Arizona

Case No. MD-05-0999A

**CONSENT AGREEMENT FOR
LETTER OF REPRIMAND**

CONSENT AGREEMENT

By mutual agreement and understanding, between the Arizona Medical Board ("Board") and William S. Masland, M.D. ("Respondent"), the parties agreed to the following disposition of this matter.

1. Respondent has read and understands this Consent Agreement and the stipulated Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Order ("Consent Agreement"). Respondent acknowledges that he has the right to consult with legal counsel regarding this matter.

2. By entering into this Consent Agreement, Respondent voluntarily relinquishes any rights to a hearing or judicial review in state or federal court on the matters alleged, or to challenge this Consent Agreement in its entirety as issued by the Board, and waives any other cause of action related thereto or arising from said Consent Agreement.

3. This Consent Agreement is not effective until approved by the Board and signed by its Executive Director.

4. All admissions made by Respondent are solely for final disposition of this matter and any subsequent related administrative proceedings or civil litigation involving the Board and Respondent. Therefore, said admissions by Respondent are not intended or made for any other use, such as in the context of another state or federal government

1 regulatory agency proceeding, civil or criminal court proceeding, in the State of Arizona or
2 any other state or federal court.

3 5. Upon signing this agreement, and returning this document (or a copy thereof)
4 to the Board's Executive Director, Respondent may not revoke the acceptance of the
5 Consent Agreement. Respondent may not make any modifications to the document. Any
6 modifications to this original document are ineffective and void unless mutually approved
7 by the parties.

8 6. This Consent Agreement, once approved and signed, is a public record that
9 will be publicly disseminated as a formal action of the Board and will be reported to the
10 National Practitioner Data Bank and to the Arizona Medical Board's website.

11 7. If any part of the Consent Agreement is later declared void or otherwise
12 unenforceable, the remainder of the Consent Agreement in its entirety shall remain in force
13 and effect.

14
15
16 
17 _____
WILLIAM S. MASLAND, M.D.

DATED: 3/23/06

FINDINGS OF FACT

1
2 1. The Board is the duly constituted authority for the regulation and control of
3 the practice of allopathic medicine in the State of Arizona.

4 2. Respondent is the holder of license number 6352 for the practice of
5 allopathic medicine in the State of Arizona.

6 3. The Board initiated case number MD-05-0999A after receiving a complaint
7 regarding Respondent's care and treatment of a 56 year-old female patient ("P.L.").

8 4. P.L. presented to Respondent on June 1, 2004 complaining of migratory and
9 deep pain. Respondent noted P.L. was taking 240 mg of methadone a day. Respondent
10 ordered methadone blood levels and imaging studies of P.L.'s back and ordered P.L. to
11 follow up after completion of the tests. Respondent prescribed P.L. a one month supply of
12 40 mg of methadone to be taken six times daily.

13 5. P.L. returned to Respondent for a follow up visit on June 15, 2004
14 complaining of extreme pain and asked Respondent to change her medication from
15 methadone to morphine because methadone was not helping with the pain. Respondent
16 changed the prescription to MS Contin ("morphine") 30 mg eight times daily (240 mg).

17 6. A medical record should include the medications the patient is taking and the
18 level of the medication in the patient's system, evidence of a physical examination, and the
19 patient's estimated level of pain. Respondent's records did not document P.L.'s
20 methadone levels, that he conducted a physical examination, or her pain level.

21 7. On June 24, 2004 Respondent reviewed imaging studies and noted P.L. as a
22 possible surgical candidate. Respondent referred P.L. for a surgical consultation, but P.L.
23 was determined to not be a surgical candidate. Respondent did not conduct a physical
24 examination and did not document an evaluation of P.L.'s pain.
25

1 8. On August 11, 2004 P.L. followed up with Respondent in his office.
2 Respondent noted a possible diagnosis of fibromyalgia and osteoarthritis, but did not
3 conduct a physical examination or evaluate P.L.'s pain. Respondent increased P.L.'s
4 medication to morphine 30 mg nine times daily ("Morphine #270"). However, Respondent
5 logged the prescription as written on August 2, 2004.

6 9. On October 7, 2004 P.L. followed up with Respondent in his office. Although
7 Respondent documented a refill of Morphine #270 on this date, it is noted in the record as
8 being prescribed on September 9, 2004. Respondent prescribed immediate release
9 morphine 15 mg quantity 30 for acute flare ups in pain. Respondent noted P.L.'s
10 complaints of gastro-intestinal ("GI") pain; but he did not conduct a physical examination
11 and did not chart her pain levels.

12 10. On December 3, 2004 Respondent refilled P.L.'s prescriptions for immediate
13 release morphine and morphine #270. Respondent logged the prescription as written on
14 November 11, 2004.

15 11. On February 02, 2005 P.L. followed up with Respondent in the office and
16 again complained of GI pain. P.L. asked Respondent to change her medications from
17 morphine to methadone. Respondent changed the medication from morphine to
18 methadone with a 1:1 ratio (270 mg morphine to 270 mg methadone). Respondent did not
19 conduct a physical examination, document an evaluation of P.L.'s pain, did not order
20 laboratory work and did not schedule a follow up.

21 12. On February 05, 2005 P.L. was found unresponsive in her home by her
22 spouse. She was transferred to the hospital emergency department ("ED") where she was
23 intubated and revived. ED physician diagnosed P.L. as having respiratory arrest and
24 possible methadone overdose.
25

13. The standard of care required Respondent, when switching from one long acting opioid to another, to convert the medication by under dosing P.L. by 10-20 %.

14. Respondent deviated from the standard of care because he failed to prescribe methadone in correct conversion dose from morphine to methadone and gave P.L. a quadruple overdose.

15. The standard of care required Respondent to properly and correctly write a prescription for methadone.

16. Respondent deviated from the standard of care because he wrote a prescription for methadone with a 1:1 conversion from morphine.

17. The standard of care required Respondent to order an electrocardiogram (EKG) and lab work for P.L. prior to changing the medication to methadone from a long acting morphine.

18. Respondent deviated from the standard of care because he failed to obtain EKG and lab work prior to changing P.L.'s medications.

19. The standard of care required Respondent to develop a treatment plan for P.L.'s pain management.

20. Respondent deviated from the standard of care because he failed to develop a treatment plan for P.L.

21. P.L. was harmed because Respondent improperly converted a prescription of morphine to methadone resulting in P.L. overdosing on methadone and sustaining a speech impairment and mental trauma.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1 The Board possesses jurisdiction over the subject matter hereof and over Respondent.

1 EXECUTED COPY of the foregoing mailed
2 this 9th day of June, 2006 to:

3 EXECUTED COPY of the foregoing mailed
4 this 9th day of June, 2006 to:

5 William S. Masland, M.D.
6 Address of Record

7 Lin McGraw
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
Investigational Review